

To:
Fr:

SECRET

20 September 1951

Sj: Flash Report on Carriage Assessment Test of Nikolajs Balodis yesterday.

1. This report is for your operational use, and covers all the essential questions put. Report may not be disseminated complete, but summaries and excerpts may be disseminated, PROVIDED that the "estimated reliability of the results" is always quoted.

2. Estimated Reliability of Results: Subject was strongly and fairly consistently responsive. However, there is some evidence of his having some sort of general "guilt complex" which can only be ~~more~~ re-solved accurately by detailed and probably pressure interrogation. I am sending you separately a memo on the subject of the interrogation of Latvians. Pending the outcome of this interrogation effort, I must class the results as ~~unreliable~~ somewhere between "fairly reliable" and "unreliable", in the scale of "reliable", "fairly reliable", and "unreliable". Any securing of a reasonable admission on any of the questions listed in paragraph 4 would immediately raise the level of reliability to "reliable".

3. Questions to which the subject was apparently answering truthfully, as shown:

Questions relating to identity.

In the past were you ever an espionage agent for the Soviet-Russians or for other Communists? No. (Note Para 4)

Were you ever a Police stool-pigeon? No.

As far as you know, are you homosexually inclined? No.

Were you a prisoner of the British in 1945? ^{November} Yes.

Have you got secret connections with the Communists? No.

4. Questions which disturbed the subject, assessed as shown:

Do you know what an espionage agent is? Yes.

Do you know who Josef Stalin is? Yes.

Do you know who Karl Marx was? Yes.

Are you an espionage agent of the Soviet-Russians or of another Communist group?

Are you an agent of the Communists?

These questions clearly disturbed the subject, especially the longest one, but not to an extent that would normally indicate in this type of pattern an active agency. He may have a guilt-complex about this — especially in view of his mixed ancestry and cloudy past — he may also have contemplated such a step or have it in mind or be playing footy-footy with someone he suspects of representing the Communists. Without interrogation this can not be clearly resolved. (Note pertinent memo or even date.)

Did you ever for your private purposes commit a robbery, a murder, or engage in counterfeiting? No.

Are you trying to conceal a crime from us? No. Both these questions disturbed the subject about as much as the questions regarding the enemy-agency questions, probably indicating that the subject has one or more crimes in his background but that these are not (in his possibly erroneous opinion) crimes presently punishable ^{in the West} at least as long as known only to us.

(over).

SECRET

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2006

SECRET

Do you recall your written statement regarding your life-history? Yes.

Did you tell us an important untruth in it? No.

"Were you ever taken prisoner by the Russians? No.

Did the Communists take away your house, land and mill? Yes.

These four questions moderately bothered the subject, perhaps because they were asked within the framework of the following two questions:

As far as you know, did your wife re-marry? Yes. To this subject later stated he was very unsure. His sensitivity was marked. It is quite likely that he has cooked up this re-marriage story to cover his present efforts to get married (or vice-versa), but this he did not admit.

Are you trying to conceal something important about your life-history? No. Sensitivity was also marked and consistent, and I feel that, regardless of his possible "complex", on this point he is lying.

in general

Do you understand what Communism is? Yes.

Do you know what is meant by the phrase: main objective? Yes.

Is it your main objective to liberate your fatherland from the Communists? Yes. Sensitivity ~~max~~ on this question, in a subject who wrote "Everything for Latvia!" in his life-history statement is natural. However, the continuation of it indicates the subject has actually got lively self-doubts and just as well ulterior motives.

Do you know Roger Macmillan, who also calls himself "Buddy"? No.

Did you work with him in 1949? No. These were fictitious questions, but clearly disturbed the subject, indicating that there may be some fire under the smoke raised by the following (surprise) question:

Are you an agent of the British, the Germans, or the French? No.

(Note preceding two questions.) This question gave the subject a fairly good shock, and, although the sensitivity diminished, there appears to be something important on the subject's mind concerning this subject.

Did you keep notes on your life-history or make a copy? No.

Probably did; sensitivity to this (surprise) question was marked and characteristic.

Have you told someone you should not about your relationship to us? No.

These weasel-words provoked a not unusual reaction.

5. Summary & Estimate: Subject is probably the person he claims to be. He appears to have committed a serious crime or two in the past and has something on his mind regarding working for the Communists, although this is believed to be minor. Subject appears to have major reservations concerning his life-history and his motivation and is touchy about the question of being an agent for the British, French, or Germans.

Subject is a robust individual and appears to be a very sensitive being, very possibly quite maladjusted and neurotic, although apparently basically sound.

6. Remarks & Recommendations: This case highlights the interrogator-difficulty discussed in memo of even date. Subject is not safe to use except in a limited circle already known to him until more light on him is obtained.

see Memo of 12-10